arXiv:1201.1560v2 [math.AP] 7 Apr 2012

Global Classical Solutions of Viscous Liquid-gas Two-phase Flow Model

Haibo Cui, Huanyao Wen[*], Haiyan Yin

Department of Mathematics, Central China Normal University, Wuhan 430079, China

Abstract

In this paper, we consider the global existence and uniqueness of the classical solutions for the 3D viscous liquid-gas two-phase flow model. Initial data is only small in the energy-norm. Our main ideas come from [16] where the existence of global classical solutions to the compressible Navier-Stokes equations was obtained by using the continuity methods under the assumption that the initial energy is sufficiently small.

Keyword: Viscous liquid-gas two-phase flow model, classical solutions, global existence.

AMS Subject Classification (2000): 76T10, 76N10.

1 Introduction

In this paper, we consider the following viscous liquid-gas two-phase flow model

$$\begin{cases} m_t + \mathrm{div}(mu) = 0, \\ n_t + \mathrm{div}(nu) = 0, \\ (mu)_t + \mathrm{div}(mu \otimes u) + \nabla P(m,n) = \mu\Delta u + (\mu+\lambda)\nabla\mathrm{div}u, \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^3 \times (0,\infty), \end{cases} \tag{1.1}$$

with the initial and boundary conditions

$$(m,n,u)|_{t=0} = (m_0, n_0, u_0)(x), \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^3, \tag{1.2}$$

$$u(x,t) \to 0, \quad m(x,t) \to \tilde{m} > 0, \quad n(x,t) \to \tilde{n} > 0, \quad \text{as } |x| \to \infty, \quad t \geq 0. \tag{1.3}$$

Here $m = \alpha_l \rho_l$ and $n = \alpha_g \rho_g$ denote liquid mass and gas mass, respectively; μ, λ are viscosity constants, satisfying

$$\mu > 0, \quad 2\mu + 3\lambda \geq 0, \tag{1.4}$$

which deduces $\mu + \lambda > 0$. The unknown variables α_l, $\alpha_g \in [0,1]$ denote liquid and gas volume fractions respectively, satisfying the fundamental relation: $\alpha_l + \alpha_g = 1$. Furthermore, the other unknown variables ρ_l and ρ_g denote liquid and gas densities respectively, satisfying equations of state: $\rho_l = \rho_{l,0} + \frac{P-P_{l,0}}{a_l^2}$, $\rho_g = \frac{P}{a_g^2}$, where a_l, a_g are sonic speeds, respectively, in liquid and gas, and $P_{l,0}$ and $\rho_{l,0}$ are respectively the reference pressure and density given as constants; u denotes velocities of liquid and gas; P is common pressure for both phases, which satisfies

$$P(m,n) = C^0\left(-b(m,n) + \sqrt{b(m,n)^2 + c(m,n)}\right), \tag{1.5}$$

---

[*] Corresponding author. E-mail: huanyaowen@hotmail.com

with $C^0 = \frac{1}{2}a_l^2$, $k_0 = \rho_{l,0} - \frac{P_{l,0}}{a_l^2} > 0$, $a_0 = (\frac{a_g}{a_l})^2$ and

$$b(m,n) = k_0 - m - \left(\frac{a_g}{a_l}\right)^2 n = k_0 - m - a_0 n,$$

$$c(m,n) = 4k_0\left(\frac{a_g}{a_l}\right)^2 n = 4k_0 a_0 n.$$

The detailed explanations about the above model can refer to [14], we omit it here.

We should mention that the methods introduced by Evje and Karlsen in [3], Yao, Zhang and Zhu in [14] for the two-phase flow model and Hoff in [7, 8], Zhang and Fang in [15], Zhang in [16] for the single-phase Navier-Stokes equations will play crucial roles in our proof here.

As in [3], we give the potential energy function G in the form

$$G(m,\frac{n}{m}) = m\int_{\tilde{m}}^{m} \frac{P(s,\frac{n}{m}s) - P(\tilde{m},\tilde{n})}{s^2}ds + \frac{m}{\tilde{m}}P(\tilde{m},\tilde{n}) - \frac{m}{\tilde{m}}P(\tilde{m},\frac{n}{m}\tilde{m}). \tag{1.6}$$

Now we assume that the initial data (m_0, n_0, u_0) will be measured in the norm given by

$$E_0 = \int\left(\frac{1}{2}m_0|u_0|^2 + G\left(m_0,\frac{n_0}{m_0}\right)\right)dx. \tag{1.7}$$

Let

$$M = \int |\nabla u_0|^2 dx. \tag{1.8}$$

It follows that there is a constant q, which will be fixed throughout, such that

$$q \in (1,\frac{4}{3}), \quad with \quad q^2 < \frac{4\mu}{\mu+\lambda}, \quad and \quad \lambda < 3\mu. \tag{1.9}$$

The vorticity matrix and the effective viscous flux are defined respectively as follows:

$$\omega^{j,k} = \partial_k u^j - \partial_j u^k, \tag{1.10}$$

and

$$F = (\lambda + 2\mu)\mathrm{div}u - P(m,n) + P(\tilde{m},\tilde{n}). \tag{1.11}$$

From (1.10) and (1.11), we have

$$\Delta u^j = \partial_j(\frac{F + P(m,n) - P(\tilde{m},\tilde{n})}{\lambda + 2\mu}) + \partial_i(\omega^{j,i}). \tag{1.12}$$

Finally, we denote the material derivative $\frac{D}{Dt}$ by $\frac{D\omega}{Dt} = \dot{\omega} = \omega_t + u\cdot\nabla\omega$ for function $\omega(x,t)$.

The following is the main result of this paper.

Theorem 1.1. *For sufficiently small constants* $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$, $\underline{m}_0 > 0$, $\overline{m}_0 > 0$, $\underline{n}_0$ *and* $\overline{n}_0$, *with* $\underline{m}_0 \le \tilde{m} \le \overline{m}_0$, $\underline{n}_0 \le \tilde{n} \le \overline{n}_0$, *let the initial data* $(m_0(x), n_0(x), u_0(x))$ *satisfy*

$$\begin{cases} \underline{m}_0 \le \inf\limits_x m_0 \le \sup\limits_x m_0 \le \overline{m}_0, \\ \underline{n}_0 \le \inf\limits_x n_0 \le \sup\limits_x n_0 \le \overline{n}_0, \\ 0 < E_0 \le \varepsilon, \\ m_0 - \tilde{m}, n_0 - \tilde{n}, u_0 \in H^3. \end{cases} \tag{1.13}$$

Define

$$\underline{s}_0 = \inf_x \frac{n_0}{m_0}, \;\; \overline{s}_0 = \sup_x \frac{n_0}{m_0}. \tag{1.14}$$

Furthermore, assume that

$$\overline{s}_0 = \frac{\tilde{n}}{\tilde{m}}. \tag{1.15}$$

Then there exist constants $\underline{m}, \overline{m}$*, with* $\underline{m} < \underline{m}_0 < \overline{m}_0 < \overline{m}$ *and* $\overline{m} > \frac{\tilde{n}}{\underline{s}_0}$*, such that the problem (1.1)-(1.3) has a unique global classical solution* $(m, n, u)(x, t)$ *satisfying*

$$\begin{cases} 0 < \underline{m} \le m(x,t) \le \overline{m}, \\ \underline{s}_0 \underline{m} \le n(x,t) \le \overline{s}_0 \overline{m}, \\ (m - \tilde{m}, n - \tilde{n}, u) \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^3 \times (0,T]) \cap C([0,T], H^3) \cap C^1((0,T], H^2), \end{cases} \tag{1.16}$$

furthermore, we have

$$\sup_{t\in[0,T]} \|(m - \tilde{m}, n - \tilde{n}, u)\|_{H^3} + \sup_{t\in[0,T]} \|(m_t, n_t)\|_{H^2} + \int_0^T \|u\|_{H^4}^2 dt \le C(T), \quad \forall T > 0. \tag{1.17}$$

$$\sup_{t\in(\tau,T]} \|u_t\|_{H^2} \le C(\tau, T), \quad \forall \tau > 0, \; T > 0. \tag{1.18}$$

Remark 1.1. *It is easy to verify*

$$\begin{cases} P_m = \frac{\partial P}{\partial m} = C^0 \left\{ 1 - \frac{b}{\sqrt{b^2+c}} \right\} > 0, \\ P_n = \frac{\partial P}{\partial n} = C^0 \left\{ a_0 + \frac{a_0}{\sqrt{b^2+c}}(m + a_0 n + k_0) \right\} > 0, \quad m, \; n > 0. \end{cases} \tag{1.19}$$

This shows that $P(m, n)$ *is increasing in* m *and* n *for* $m, \; n > 0$.

Remark 1.2. *It should be mentioned that the existence of global strong solutions for 3D with vacuum was obtained recently by Guo, Yang and Yao, please see [6], where the initial energy was assumed to be small enough and the solutions satisfied*

$$0 \le \underline{s}_0 m \le n \le \overline{s}_0 m, \;\; (m - \tilde{m}, n - \tilde{n}) \in C([0,T]; W^{1,q_0} \cap H^1),$$
$$u \in C([0,T]; D_0^1 \cap D^2) \cap L^2(0,T; D^{2,q_0}), \;\; u_t \in L^2(0,T; D_0^1), \;\; \sqrt{m} u_t \in L^\infty(0,T; L^2),$$

for some $q_0 \in (3, 6]$. *It seems impossible to consider the existence of classical solutions under the assumptions of [6], since higher order derivatives of the pressure function are unbounded on* $\{(m, n) | m = k_0, n = 0\}$*, such as*

$$\partial_n^2 P(m,n) = \frac{-4C^0 a_0^2 k_0 m}{\left[(k_0 - m - a_0 n)^2 + 4k_0 a_0 n \right]^{\frac{3}{2}}} = \infty, \text{ on } \{(m,n) | m = k_0, n = 0\}. \tag{1.20}$$

It seems that the assumption $\inf n_0 > 0$ *and* $\inf m_0 \ge 0$ *is enough. While, for simplicity, we assume that both* n_0 *and* m_0 *are positive in Theorem 1.1. In this case, the compatibility condition like (1.16) in [6] is not necessary.*

2 The proof of Theorem 1.1

The local existence of the solutions to (1.1)-(1.3) with the regularities as in Theorem 1.1 can be obtained by the similar methods as in [1], [11] and the references therein. We omit it here for brevity. The regularities guarantee the uniqueness (refer for instance to [8]). Let $[0, T^*)$ be the maximal existence interval of the above solutions. Note that the local existence of the solutions guarantees $T^* > 0$. Our goal is to prove $T^* = \infty$ by using a contradiction argument. More precisely, suppose $T^* < \infty$, our aim is to get

$$\sup_{t\in[0,T]} \|(m - \tilde{m}, n - \tilde{n}, u)\|_{H^3} \leq K, \tag{2.1}$$

and

$$\inf_{(x,t)\in\mathbb{R}^3\times[0,T]} m \geq \frac{1}{K}, \inf_{(x,t)\in\mathbb{R}^3\times[0,T]} n \geq \frac{1}{K}, \tag{2.2}$$

for any $T \in (0, T^*)$, where K is a generic positive constant depending only on T^* and other known constants but independent of T. With (2.1) and (2.2), T^* is not the maximal existence time of the solutions, which is the desired contradiction.

The proof is divided into two steps. It should be pointed that the $H^1 \times H^2$-estimates of $((m, n), u)$ could be obtained by the same arguments as in [6]. For completeness, we still present some of the crucial estimates which might be slightly different from those as in [6] with m and n positive lower bounds. For the higher order estimates of (m, n, u), we shall apply some ideas which were used to handle the 3D single-phase Navier-Stokes equations, see for instance [16]. More precisely, we proceed as follows.

Step 1: The bounds of the density.

Claim: There exist $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ sufficiently small and $\underline{m} \in (0, \underline{m}_0)$, and $\overline{m} \in (\overline{m}_0, \infty)$, and $\overline{m} > \frac{\tilde{n}}{\underline{s}_0}$, such that for any given $T \in (0, T^*)$, the following estimates hold:

$$\underline{m} \leq m(x, t) \leq \overline{m}, \ (x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^3 \times [0, T], \tag{2.3}$$

$$A_1(T) + A_2(T) \leq 2E_0^{\theta}, \tag{2.4}$$

for some $\theta \in (0, 1)$, provided the initial energy $E_0 \leq \varepsilon$. Here we have used the following two notations:

$$A_1(T) = \sup_{t\in[0,T]} \sigma \int |\nabla u|^2 dx + \int_0^T \int \sigma |\dot{u}|^2 dxdt,$$
$$A_2(T) = \sup_{t\in[0,T]} \sigma^3 \int |\dot{u}|^2 dx + \int_0^T \int \sigma^3 |\nabla \dot{u}|^2 dxdt, \tag{2.5}$$

where $\sigma = \sigma(t) = \min\{1, t\}$.

Define

$$T_0 = \sup\left\{S \in [0, T] \middle| \ \underline{m} \leq m(x, t) \leq \overline{m}, \ (x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^3 \times [0, S], \text{ and } A_1(S) + A_2(S) \leq 2E_0^{\theta}\right\}.$$

To get (2.3) and (2.4), it suffices to prove $T_0 = T$.

Since $\underline{m} < m_0(x) < \overline{m}$ and $A_1(0) = A_2(0) = 0$, we get $T_0 > 0$ by using the continuity of m, $A_1(t)$ and $A_2(t)$ with respect to t over $[0, T]$.

To get $T_0 = T$, it suffices to prove

$$\underline{m} < \underline{m}_1 \leq m(x, t) \leq \overline{m}_1 < \overline{m}, \text{ for some constants } \underline{m}_1 \text{ and } \overline{m}_1,$$

and

$$A_1(t) + A_2(t) \leq E_0^{\theta}, \quad \forall t \in [0, T_0],$$

provided the initial energy $E_0 \le \varepsilon$, for $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small.

From the momentum equation $(1.1)_3$ and (1.10), (1.11), we have

$$m\dot{u}^j = \partial_j F + \mu \partial_k \omega^{j,k}, \tag{2.6}$$

which implies

$$\Delta F = \operatorname{div}(m\dot{u}), \tag{2.7}$$

and

$$\mu \Delta \omega^{j,k} = \partial_k(m\dot{u}^j) - \partial_j(m\dot{u}^k). \tag{2.8}$$

This shows that the L^2 estimate of $m\dot{u}$ implies L^2 bounds of ∇F and $\nabla\omega$. Equations (2.7) and (2.8) will play important roles in this section.

Throughout the rest of the paper, we denote the generic constant by C depending on the initial data and other known constants, but independent of T_0, T and T^*. We omit the integration domain when we integrate some functions over $\mathbb{R}^3$.

Lemma 2.1. *Under the conditions of Theorem 1.1, it holds that*

$$\frac{m}{C} \le n \le Cm. \tag{2.9}$$

Proof. The proof of Lemma 2.1 can be found by Yao-Zhang-Zhu in [14].

□

Lemma 2.2. *Under the conditions of Theorem 1.1, it holds that*

$$\sup_{t\in[0,T_0]} \int \left(|u|^2 + (m-\tilde{m})^2 + (n-\tilde{n})^2\right) dx + \int_0^{T_0} \int |\nabla u|^2 dxdt \le CE_0. \tag{2.10}$$

Proof. Let

$$A(t) = \int \left\{ \frac{1}{2} m|u|^2 + G\left(m, \frac{n}{m}\right) \right\} dx. \tag{2.11}$$

Differentiating $A(t)$ with respect to t, using integration by parts and the equation (1.1), we get (2.10).

□

Lemma 2.3. *Under the conditions of Theorem 1.1, it holds that*

$$A_1(T_0) \le CE_0 + C\int_0^{T_0} \int \sigma |\nabla u|^3 dxdt, \tag{2.12}$$

and

$$A_2(T_0) \le CE_0 + C\int_0^{T_0} \int \sigma |\nabla u|^3 dxdt + C\int_0^{T_0} \int \sigma^3 |\nabla u|^4 dxdt. \tag{2.13}$$

Proof. The estimates (2.12) and (2.13) can been obtained by the similar arguments as that in [14].

□

To handle the higher order terms on the right-hand sides of (2.12) and (2.13), we need the following lemma whose proof can be found in [14] and references therein.

Lemma 2.4. *Under the conditions of Theorem 1.1, it holds that*

$$\|u\|_{L^p} \le C_p \|u\|_{L^2}^{\frac{6-p}{2p}} \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^{\frac{3p-6}{2p}}, \quad p \in [2,6]. \tag{2.14}$$

$$\|u\|_{L^p}^p \le C_p E_0^{\frac{6-p}{4}} \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^{\frac{3p-6}{2}}, \quad p \in [2,6]. \tag{2.15}$$

$$\|\nabla u\|_{L^r} \le C_r(\|F\|_{L^r} + \|\omega\|_{L^r} + \|P(m,n) - P(\tilde{m},\tilde{n})\|_{L^r}), \ \ r \in (1,\infty). \tag{2.16}$$

$$\|\nabla F\|_{L^r} + \|\nabla \omega\|_{L^r} \le C_r \|m\dot{u}\|_{L^r}, \ \ r \in (1,\infty). \tag{2.17}$$

$$\|F\|_{L^p} + \|\omega\|_{L^p} \le C_p \|m\dot{u}\|_{L^2}^{\frac{3p-6}{2p}} \left(\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^{\frac{6-p}{2p}} + \|P(m,n) - P(\tilde{m},\tilde{n})\|_{L^2}^{\frac{6-p}{2p}} \right), \quad p \in [2,6]. \tag{2.18}$$

Also, for $0 \le t_1 \le t_2 \le T_0$*,* $l \ge 2$ *and* $s \ge 0$*, we have*

$$\int_{t_1}^{t_2} \int \sigma^s |P(m,n) - P(\tilde{m},\tilde{n})|^l dxds \le C \left(\int_{t_1}^{t_2} \int \sigma^s |F|^l dxds + E_0 \right). \tag{2.19}$$

Lemma 2.5. *Under the conditions of Theorem 1.1, there exists a constant* $T_1 > 0$*, such that*

$$\sup_{t\in[0,T_0]} \int |\nabla u|^2 dx + \int_0^{T_0 \wedge T_1} \int |\dot{u}|^2 dxdt \le C(1+M), \tag{2.20}$$

where we have used the notation $e_1 \wedge e_2 = \min\{e_1, e_2\}$*.*

Proof. Similar to the proof of (2.12), multiplying $(1.1)_3$ by $\dot{u}$, integrating the resulting equation over $\mathbb{R}^3 \times [0,t]$ ($t \in [0,T_0]$), and using integration by parts, Hölder inequality, and Cauchy inequality, we have

$$\int |\nabla u|^2 dx + \int_0^t \int |\dot{u}|^2 dxds \le C(E_0 + M) + C \int_0^t \int |\nabla u|^3 dxds,$$

It follows from (2.16) and (2.19) that

$$\int_0^t \int |\nabla u|^3 dxds \le C + C \int_0^t \int (|F|^3 + |\omega|^3) dxds.$$

By (2.18), we get

$$\int (|F|^3 + |\omega|^3) dx \le C \left(\int (|\nabla u|^2 + |P(m,n) - P(\tilde{m},\tilde{n})|^2) dx \right)^{\frac{3}{4}} \left(\int m|\dot{u}|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{3}{4}}. \tag{2.21}$$

Thus, from Lemma 2.2 and Young inequality with ε, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int |\nabla u|^2 dx + \int_0^t \int |\dot{u}|^2 dxds \\
&\le C(1+M) + C \int_0^t \left(\int (|\nabla u|^2 + |P(m,n) - P(\tilde{m},\tilde{n})|^2) dx \right)^{\frac{3}{4}} \left(\int m|\dot{u}|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{3}{4}} ds \\
&\le C(1+M) + C \int_0^t \left(\int (|\nabla u|^2 + |P(m,n) - P(\tilde{m},\tilde{n})|^2) dx \right)^3 ds + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t \int |\dot{u}|^2 dxds \\
&\le C(1+M) + Ct \sup_{s\in[0,t]} \|\nabla u(\cdot,s)\|_{L^2}^6 + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t \int |\dot{u}|^2 dxds \\
&\le C(1+M) + Ct(1+M)^2 \|\nabla u(\cdot,s)\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t \int |\dot{u}|^2 dxds,
\end{aligned}$$

for $t \in (0,1) \cap (0,T_0)$ sufficiently small, where we have used the continuity of $\int |\nabla u|^2(x,t)\, dx$ with respect to t over $[0,T_0]$. Taking $T_1 = \min\{\frac{1}{8C(1+M)^2}, 1\}$ and letting $t \le T_0 \wedge T_1$, we obtain (2.20). □

Lemma 2.6. *Under the conditions of Theorem 1.1, for $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small, we have*

$$\sup_{t\in[0,T_0]}\int(\sigma|\nabla u|^2+\sigma^3|\dot{u}|^2)dx+\int_0^{T_0}\int(\sigma|\dot{u}|^2+\sigma^3|\nabla\dot{u}|^2)dxdt\le E_0^{\theta}. \tag{2.22}$$

Proof. From (2.12) and (2.13), we have

$$LHS\ of\ (2.22)\le CE_0+C\int_0^{T_0}\int(\sigma|\nabla u|^3+\sigma^3|\nabla u|^4)dxds. \tag{2.23}$$

By (2.16), we have

$$\int_0^{T_0}\int\sigma^3|\nabla u|^4dxds\le C\int_0^{T_0}\int\sigma^3[|F|^4+|\omega|^4+|P(m,n)-P(\tilde{m},\tilde{n})|^4]dxds. \tag{2.24}$$

Using (2.4), (2.10), (2.14) and (2.17)-(2.19), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_0^{T_0}\int\sigma^3\left(|F|^4+|\omega|^4\right)dxds\\
&\le C\int_0^{T_0}\sigma^3\left[\left(\int|F|^2dx\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(\int|\nabla F|^2dx\right)^{\frac{3}{2}}+\left(\int|\omega|^2dx\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(\int|\nabla\omega|^2dx\right)^{\frac{3}{2}}\right]ds\\
&\le C\int_0^{T_0}\sigma^3\left(\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}+\|\nabla P(m,n)-P(\tilde{m},\tilde{n})\|_{L^2}\right)\|m\dot{u}\|_{L^2}^3ds\\
&\le C\sup_{t\in[0,T_0]}\left\{\int\sigma(|\nabla u|^2+|P(m,n)-P(\tilde{m},\tilde{n})|^2)dx\int\sigma^3m|\dot{u}|^2ds\right\}^{\frac{1}{2}}\\
&\quad\times\int_0^{T_0}\int\sigma m|\dot{u}|^2dxds\\
&\le CE_0^{2\theta}.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.25}$$

From (2.25), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_0^{T_0}\int\sigma^3|P(m,n)-P(\tilde{m},\tilde{n})|^4dxds&\le C\left(\int_0^{T_0}\int\sigma^3|F|^4dxds+E_0\right)\\
&\le CE_0^{2\theta}+CE_0.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.26}$$

From (2.24)-(2.26), we have

$$\int_0^{T_0}\int\sigma^3|\nabla u|^4\le CE_0^{2\theta}+CE_0. \tag{2.27}$$

From (2.27), (2.10), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{T_0\wedge T_1}^{T_0}\int\sigma|\nabla u|^3dxds&\le\tfrac{1}{2}\int_{T_0\wedge T_1}^{T_0}\int(\sigma^2|\nabla u|^4+|\nabla u|^2)dxds\\
&\le C(T_1)\int_{T_0\wedge T_1}^{T_0}\int(\sigma^3|\nabla u|^4+|\nabla u|^2)dxds\\
&\le C(M)E_0^{2\theta}+C(M)E_0,
\end{aligned} \tag{2.28}$$

where we have used Lemma 2.5.

From (2.4), (2.10), (2.16), (2.18), (2.19) and Lemma 2.5, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\int_0^{T_0\wedge T_1}\int \sigma|\nabla u|^3 dxds\\
&\le CE_0 + \int_0^{T_0\wedge T_1}\int \sigma(|F|^3+|\omega|^3)dxds\\
&\le CE_0 + \int_0^{T_0\wedge T_1} \sigma\left(\int(|\nabla u|^2+|P(m,n)-P(\tilde{m},\tilde{n})|^2)dx\right)^{\frac{3}{4}}\left(\int m|\dot{u}|^2dx\right)^{\frac{3}{4}}ds\\
&\le C(M)E_0 + C\left\{\sup_{t\in[0,T_0]}\sigma\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^4\int_0^{T_0\wedge T_1}\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2ds+\int_0^{T_0\wedge T_1}\sigma\|P(m,n)-P(\tilde{m},\tilde{n})\|_{L^2}^6dt\right\}^{\frac{1}{4}}\\
&\quad\times\left(\int_0^{T_0\wedge T_1}\sigma\|m\dot{u}\|_{L^2}^2ds\right)^{\frac{3}{4}}\\
&\le C(M)E_0 + C(M)E_0^{\frac{1}{4}+\theta}+C(M)E_0^{\frac{3}{4}(1+\theta)}.
\end{aligned}
\tag{2.29}
$$

Then, from (2.4), (2.23), (2.27)-(2.29), we obtain

$$LHS\ of\ (2.22) \le C(M)E_0^{1\wedge 2\theta\wedge\frac{3}{4}(1+\theta)\wedge(\frac{1}{4}+\theta)}. \tag{2.30}$$

Thus, when ε is sufficiently small such that $C(M)\varepsilon^{(1-\theta)\wedge\theta\wedge(\frac{3}{4}-\frac{1}{4}\theta)\wedge\frac{1}{4}} \le 1$, we can get

$$LHS\ of\ (2.22) \le E_0^{\theta}. \tag{2.31}$$

This completes the proof of Lemma 2.6. □

From Lemma 2.5, Lemma 2.6 and Ref. [16] (Propositions 3-5), we can get the next lemma.

Lemma 2.7. *Under the conditions of Theorem 1.1, it holds*

$$\sup_{t\in[0,T_0]}\int|\nabla u|^2dx+\int_0^{T_0}\int|\dot{u}|^2dxdt \le C(M). \tag{2.32}$$

If we assume further that there exists $q\in(1,\frac{4}{3})$ satisfying $q^2<\frac{4\mu}{\lambda+\mu}$, then we have

$$\sup_{t\in[0,T_0]}\sigma^{p_1}\int|\dot{u}|^{2+q}dx+\int_0^{T_0}\int\sigma^{p_1}|\dot{u}|^q|\nabla\dot{u}|^2dxdt\le C(M),\quad p_1=1+\frac{5q}{4}. \tag{2.33}$$

Lemma 2.8. *Under the conditions of Theorem 1.1, it holds*

$$\|F\|_{L^\infty}+\|\omega\|_{L^\infty}\le C(\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}+\|m-\tilde{m}\|_{L^2}+\|n-\tilde{n}\|_{L^2})^{\frac{2q-2}{4+5q}}\|m\dot{u}\|_{L^{2+q}}^{\frac{6+3q}{4+5q}}, \tag{2.34}$$

and

$$\int_0^{T_0}(\|F\|_{L^\infty}+\|\omega\|_{L^\infty})ds\le C(M)E_0^{\frac{\theta(q-1)}{4+5q}}(1+T_0),\quad q\in(1,\frac{4}{3}). \tag{2.35}$$

Proof. From (2.10), (2.17), (2.22), and the Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\|F\|_{L^\infty}&\le C\|F\|_{L^2}^{\frac{2(q-1)}{4+5q}}\|\nabla F\|_{L^{2+q}}^{\frac{6+3q}{4+5q}}\\
&\le C(\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}+\|m-\tilde{m}\|_{L^2}+\|n-\tilde{n}\|_{L^2})^{\frac{2(q-1)}{4+5q}}\|m\dot{u}\|_{L^{2+q}}^{\frac{6+3q}{4+5q}},
\end{aligned}
\tag{2.36}
$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^{T_0} \|F\|_{L^\infty} ds &\le \int_0^{T_0} (\|\nabla u\|_{L^2} + \|m-\tilde{m}\|_{L^2} + \|n-\tilde{n}\|_{L^2})^{\frac{2(q-1)}{4+5q}} \|m\dot{u}\|_{L^{2+q}}^{\frac{6+3q}{4+5q}} ds \\ &\le C(M) \int_0^{T_0} (\sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}} E_0^{\frac{\theta}{2}})^{\frac{2(q-1)}{4+5q}} (\sigma^{-\frac{p_1}{2+q}})^{\frac{6+3q}{4+5q}} ds \\ &\le C(M) E_0^{\frac{\theta(q-1)}{4+5q}} (1+T_0). \end{aligned} \tag{2.37}$$

Similarly, we can obtain the same estimates for ω. This completes the proof of Lemma 2.8. □

Now, we apply the estimates in Lemmas 2.8-2.9 and the hypothesis (2.3) to close the bounds of m.

Lemma 2.9. *Under the conditions of Theorem 1.1, for given constants* $\underline{m}_1$ *and* $\overline{m}_1$ *satisfying* $0 < \underline{m} < \underline{m}_1 < \tilde{m} < \overline{m}_1 < \overline{m}$ *and* $\overline{m}_1 \ge \frac{\tilde{n}}{\underline{s}_0}$, *there exists a constant* $\varepsilon > 0$ *sufficiently small, such that*

$$\underline{m}_1 \le m(x,t) \le \overline{m}_1, \quad (x,t) \in \mathbb{R}^3 \times [0, T_0], \tag{2.38}$$

provided that $E_0 \le \varepsilon$. *Furthermore, the estimates in Lemma 2.2-2.8 hold.*

Proof. Using the similar argument as that in Ref. [14] (Proposition 2.5) and Ref. [16] (Proposition 7), we can easily obtain this lemma in $\mathbb{R}^3$ and omit the details. □

By (2.22) and (2.38), we get $T_0 = T$. Thus, (2.3) and (2.4) hold for any $T \in (0, T^*)$. This ends the proof of **Step 1**.

Step 2: Estimates for the higher order derivatives of (m, n, u).

Just as in [9, 10], we introduce the quantity w, which is defined by

$$w = u - v,$$

where v is the solution of

$$\begin{cases} \mu \Delta v + (\lambda + \mu) \nabla \mathrm{div} v = \nabla P(m,n) \ \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^3, \\ v(x) = 0 \quad \text{as } \ |x| \to \infty. \end{cases} \tag{2.39}$$

The following estimates can be found in the ref. [9] (Proposition 2.1):

$$\begin{cases} \|\nabla v\|_{L^p} \le C \|P(m,n) - P(\tilde{m}, \tilde{n})\|_{L^p}, \\ \|\nabla^2 v\|_{L^p} \le C \|\nabla P(m,n)\|_{L^p}, \end{cases} \tag{2.40}$$

for any $p \in (1, \infty)$.

By using the equations (1.1), we find w satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \mu \Delta w + (\lambda + \mu) \nabla \mathrm{div} w = m\dot{u} \ \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^3, \\ w(x) = 0 \quad \text{as } \ |x| \to \infty. \end{cases} \tag{2.41}$$

Lemma 2.10. *Under the conditions of Theorem 1.1, it holds that*

$$\sup_{t \in [0,T]} \int m|\dot{u}|^2 dx + \int_0^T \int \left(|\nabla \dot{u}|^2 + |\frac{D}{Dt} \mathrm{div} u|^2 \right) dx dt \le K. \tag{2.42}$$

Proof. We take the operator $\partial_t + \mathrm{div}(u\cdot)$ in $(1.1)_3$, multiplying the resulting equations by $\dot{u}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\dot{u}^j[\partial_t(m\dot{u}^j) + \mathrm{div}(um\dot{u}^j)] + \dot{u}^j[\partial_j P_t + \mathrm{div}(u\partial_j P)]\\
&= \mu\dot{u}^j[\partial_t \Delta u^j + \mathrm{div}(u\Delta u^j)] + (\lambda+\mu)\dot{u}^j[\partial_j\partial_t(\mathrm{div}u) + \mathrm{div}(u\partial_j(\mathrm{div}u))].
\end{aligned} \tag{2.43}$$

Integrating the above equation over $\mathbb{R}^3$ and using integration by parts, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{2}\int m|\dot{u}|^2dx = \frac{1}{2}\int m_0|\dot{u}_0|^2dx &- \int_0^t\int \dot{u}^j[\partial_j P_t + \mathrm{div}(u\cdot\partial_j P)]dxds + \int_0^t\int \mu\dot{u}^j[\Delta u_t^j\\
&+\mathrm{div}(u\cdot\Delta u^j)]dxds + \int_0^t\int(\lambda+\mu)\dot{u}^j[\partial_t\partial_j\mathrm{div}u + \mathrm{div}(u\cdot\partial_j\mathrm{div}u)]dxds\\
&:= \sum_{i=1}^{4} K_i.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.44}$$

From $m_0 - \tilde{m} \in H^1$ and $u_0 \in H^2$, we know

$$K_1 = \frac{1}{2}\int m_0|\dot{u}_0|^2dx \le K. \tag{2.45}$$

From the integration by part, the equation $(1.1)_1$, $(1.1)_2$, (2.10), (2.38) and the Cauchy inequality, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
K_2 &= -\int_0^t\int \dot{u}^j[\partial_j P_t + \mathrm{div}(u\partial_j P)]dxds\\
&= \int_0^t\int\left(\partial_j\dot{u}^j(P_m m_t + P_n n_t) + \partial_k\dot{u}^j\partial_j P u^k\right)dxds\\
&= -\int_0^t\int\left(P_m(m\mathrm{div}u + u\cdot\nabla m)\partial_j\dot{u}^j + P_n(n\mathrm{div}u + u\cdot\nabla n)\partial_j\dot{u}^j\right)dxds\\
&\quad -\int_0^t\int P(m,n)\partial_j(\partial_k\dot{u}^j u^k)dxds\\
&= \int_0^t\int\left(-P_m m\mathrm{div}u\partial_j\dot{u}^j - P_n n\mathrm{div}u\partial_j\dot{u}^j + \partial_k(\partial_j\dot{u}^j u^k)P - \partial_j(\partial_k\dot{u}^j u^k)P\right)dxds\\
&= \int_0^t\int\left(-P_m m\mathrm{div}u\partial_j\dot{u}^j - P_n n\mathrm{div}u\partial_j\dot{u}^j + \partial_j\dot{u}^j\mathrm{div}uP - \partial_k\dot{u}^j\partial_j u^k P\right)dxds\\
&\le KE_0 + \frac{\mu}{4}\int_0^t\int|\nabla\dot{u}|^2dxds.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.46}$$

From the integration by part and the Cauchy inequality, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
K_3 &= \mu\int_0^t\int\dot{u}^j[\Delta u_t^j + \mathrm{div}(u\Delta u^j)]dxds\\
&= -\mu\int_0^t\int[\partial_i\dot{u}^j\partial_i u_t^j + \Delta u^j u\cdot\nabla\dot{u}^j]dxds\\
&= -\mu\int_0^t\int\left(|\nabla\dot{u}|^2 - \partial_i\dot{u}^j u^k\partial_k\partial_i u^j - \partial_i\dot{u}^j\partial_i u^k\partial_k u^j + \Delta u^j u\cdot\nabla\dot{u}^j\right)dxds\\
&= -\mu\int_0^t\int\left(|\nabla\dot{u}|^2 + \partial_i\dot{u}^j\partial_k u^k\partial_i u^j - \partial_i\dot{u}^j\partial_i u^k\partial_k u^j - \partial_i u^j\partial_i u^k\partial_k\dot{u}^j\right)dxds\\
&\le -\frac{\mu}{2}\int_0^t\int|\nabla\dot{u}|^2dxds + K\int_0^t\int|\nabla u|^4dxds.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.47}$$

From the integration by part, (2.10), (2.38) and the Cauchy inequality, we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
K_4 &= (\lambda+\mu)\int_0^t\int \dot{u}^j[\partial_t\partial_j \mathrm{div}u + \mathrm{div}(u\partial_j \mathrm{div}u)]dxds \\
&= -(\lambda+\mu)\int_0^t\int \Big(\partial_j\dot{u}^j[\partial_t(\mathrm{div}u) + \mathrm{div}(u\mathrm{div}u)] + \dot{u}^j\mathrm{div}(\partial_j u\mathrm{div}u)\Big)dxds \\
&= -(\lambda+\mu)\int_0^t\int \partial_j\dot{u}^j\frac{D}{Dt}\mathrm{div}u dxds - (\lambda+\mu)\int_0^t\int \partial_j\dot{u}^j(\mathrm{div}u)^2dxds \\
&\quad -(\lambda+\mu)\int_0^t\int \dot{u}^j\partial_i(\partial_j u^i\mathrm{div}u)dxds \\
&= -(\lambda+\mu)\int_0^t\int |\frac{D}{Dt}\mathrm{div}u|^2dxds - (\lambda+\mu)\int_0^t\int \partial_j u^i\partial_i u^j\frac{D}{Dt}\mathrm{div}u dxds \\
&\quad -(\lambda+\mu)\int_0^t\int \partial_j\dot{u}^j(\mathrm{div}u)^2dxds + (\lambda+\mu)\int_0^t\int \partial_i\dot{u}^j\partial_j u^i\mathrm{div}u dxds \\
&\le -\frac{(\lambda+\mu)}{2}\int_0^t\int |\frac{D}{Dt}\mathrm{div}u|^2dxds + \frac{\mu}{8}\int_0^t\int |\nabla\dot{u}|^2dxds + K\int_0^t\int |\nabla u|^4dxds. \qquad (2.48)
\end{aligned}
$$

Using a similar argument as Lemma 2.6, we can get

$$
\int_0^t\int |\nabla u|^4dxds \le K. \qquad (2.49)
$$

From (2.44)-(2.49) and the Cauchy inequality, we can get

$$
\frac{1}{2}\int m|\dot{u}|^2dx + \frac{\mu}{8}\int_0^t\int |\nabla\dot{u}|^2dxds + \frac{\lambda+\mu}{2}\int_0^t\int |\frac{D}{Dt}\mathrm{div}u|^2dxds \le K. \qquad (2.50)
$$

We complete the proof of Lemma 2.10. □

Corollary 2.1. *Under the conditions of Theorem 1.1, it holds that*

$$
\int_0^T \|\nabla w\|_{W^{1,l_1}}^2 ds \le K, \quad \text{where} \quad l_1\in(3,6], \quad \text{or} \;\; l_1 = 2. \qquad (2.51)
$$

Proof. From (2.38), (2.41), (2.42) and Sobolev's embedding theorem, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\int_0^T \|\nabla w\|_{W^{1,l_1}}^2 ds &\le K\int_0^T \|m\dot{u}\|_{L^{l_1}}^2 ds \\
&\le K\int_0^T \|\dot{u}\|_{L^{l_1}}^2 ds \\
&\le K\int_0^T \|\dot{u}\|_{H^1}^2 ds \\
&\le K, \qquad (2.52)
\end{aligned}
$$

where we have used the standard elliptic estimate. □

Lemma 2.11. *Under the conditions of Theorem 1.1, it holds that*

$$
\sup_{t\in[0,T]}(\|\nabla m(\cdot,t)\|_{L^{q_1}} + \|\nabla n(\cdot,t)\|_{L^{q_1}}) \le K, \qquad q_1\in(3,6]. \qquad (2.53)
$$

Proof. Differentiating the equation $(1.1)_1$ with respect to x_i, then multiplying both sides of the resulting equation by $q_1|\partial_i m|^{q_1-2}\partial_i m$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}&\partial_t|\partial_i m|^{q_1}+\mathrm{div}(|\partial_i m|^{q_1}u)+(q_1-1)|\partial_i m|^{q_1}\mathrm{div}u\\&+q_1 m|\partial_i m|^{q_1-2}\partial_i m\partial_i\mathrm{div}u+q_1|\partial_i m|^{q_1-2}\partial_i m\partial_i u\cdot\nabla m=0.\end{aligned}$$

Integrating the above equality over $\mathbb{R}^3$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{d}{dt}\int|\nabla m|^{q_1}dx\\&\le K\int|\nabla u||\nabla m|^{q_1}dx+q_1\int m|\nabla\mathrm{div}u||\nabla m|^{q_1-1}dx\\&\le K\|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty}\|\nabla m\|_{L^{q_1}}^{q_1}+K\|\nabla^2 u\|_{L^{q_1}}\|\nabla m\|_{L^{q_1}}^{q_1-1}.\end{aligned}\tag{2.54}$$

Similarly, we get

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{d}{dt}\int|\nabla n|^{q_1}dx\\&\le K\int|\nabla u||\nabla n|^{q_1}dx+q_1\int n|\nabla\mathrm{div}u||\nabla n|^{q_1-1}dx\\&\le K\|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty}\|\nabla n\|_{L^{q_1}}^{q_1}+K\|\nabla^2 u\|_{L^{q_1}}\|\nabla n\|_{L^{q_1}}^{q_1-1}.\end{aligned}\tag{2.55}$$

From (2.40), we obtain

$$\|\nabla^2 v\|_{L^{q_1}}\le K(\|\nabla m\|_{L^{q_1}}+\|\nabla n\|_{L^{q_1}}),\tag{2.56}$$

then we get

$$\begin{aligned}\|\nabla v\|_{L^\infty}&\le K\Big(1+\|\nabla v\|_{BMO}\ln(e+\|\nabla^2 v\|_{L^{q_1}})\Big)\\&\le K\Big(1+\|P\|_{L^\infty\cap L^2}\ln(e+\|\nabla P\|_{L^{q_1}})\Big)\\&\le K\Big(1+\ln(e+\|\nabla m\|_{L^{q_1}}+\|\nabla n\|_{L^{q_1}})\Big),\end{aligned}\tag{2.57}$$

where the first inequality could be found in [9].

From (2.55)-(2.57), we get

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{d}{dt}(\|\nabla m\|_{L^{q_1}}+\|\nabla n\|_{L^{q_1}})\\&\le K(1+\|\nabla w\|_{L^\infty}+\|\nabla v\|_{L^\infty})(\|\nabla m\|_{L^{q_1}}+\|\nabla n\|_{L^{q_1}})+C\|\nabla^2 w\|_{L^{q_1}}\\&\le K\left(1+\|\nabla w\|_{W^{1,q_1}}+\ln(e+\|\nabla m\|_{L^{q_1}}+\|\nabla n\|_{L^{q_1}})\right)(\|\nabla m\|_{L^{q_1}}+\|\nabla n\|_{L^{q_1}})\\&\quad+K\|\nabla^2 w\|_{L^{q_1}}.\end{aligned}$$

Note that $\|\nabla w\|_{W^{1,q_1}}\in L^2(0,T)$ by Corollary 2.1. Then by the Gronwall's inequality, we obtain (2.53). This completes the proof of Lemma 2.11. □

Corollary 2.2. *Under the conditions of Theorem 1.1, it holds that*

$$\int_0^T\|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty}^2ds\le K.\tag{2.58}$$

Proof. From (2.51), (2.53), (2.57) and Sobolev's embedding theorem, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^T \|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty}^2 ds &\le \int_0^T \|\nabla w\|_{L^\infty}^2 + \|\nabla v\|_{L^\infty}^2 ds\\ &\le K\int_0^T \|\nabla w\|_{W^{1,q_1}}^2 ds + K\\ &\le K. \end{aligned}\tag{2.59}$$

This completes the proof of Corollary 2.2. □

Lemma 2.12. *Under the conditions of Theorem 1.1, it holds that*

$$\sup_{t\in[0,T]} (\|\nabla m(\cdot,t)\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla n(\cdot,t)\|_{L^2}) \le K. \tag{2.60}$$

Proof. Differentiating the equation $(1.1)_1$ with respect to x_i, then multiplying both sides of the resulting equation by $2\partial_i m$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}&\partial_t|\partial_i m|^2 + \mathrm{div}(|\partial_i m|^2 u) + |\partial_i m|^2 \mathrm{div} u\\ &+2m\partial_i m\partial_i \mathrm{div} u + 2\partial_i m\partial_i u\cdot\nabla m = 0.\end{aligned}$$

Integrating the above equality over $\mathbb{R}^3$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{d}{dt}\int |\nabla m|^2 dx\\ &\le K\int |\nabla u||\nabla m|^2 dx + 2\int m|\nabla \mathrm{div} u||\nabla m| dx\\ &\le K\|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty}\|\nabla m\|_{L^2}^2 + K\|\nabla^2 u\|_{L^2}\|\nabla m\|_{L^2}.\end{aligned}\tag{2.61}$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{d}{dt}\int |\nabla n|^2 dx\\ &\le K\int |\nabla u||\nabla n|^2 dx + 2\int n|\nabla \mathrm{div} u||\nabla n| dx\\ &\le K\|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty}\|\nabla n\|_{L^2}^2 + K\|\nabla^2 u\|_{L^2}\|\nabla n\|_{L^2}.\end{aligned}\tag{2.62}$$

From (2.40), we obtain

$$\|\nabla^2 v\|_{L^2} \le K(\|\nabla m\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla n\|_{L^2}). \tag{2.63}$$

From (2.57) and (2.53), we get

$$\|\nabla v\|_{L^\infty} \le K. \tag{2.64}$$

From (2.61)-(2.64), we get

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{d}{dt}(\|\nabla m\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla n\|_{L^2})\\ &\le K(1+\|\nabla w\|_{L^\infty})(\|\nabla m\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla n\|_{L^2}) + K\|\nabla^2 w\|_{L^2}\\ &\le K\left(1+\|\nabla w\|_{W^{1,q_1}}\right)\left(\|\nabla m\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla n\|_{L^2}\right)\\ &\quad +K\|\nabla^2 w\|_{L^2}.\end{aligned}$$

Note that $\|\nabla w\|_{W^{1,2}}$, $\|\nabla w\|_{W^{1,q_1}} \in L^2(0,T)$ by Corollary 2.1. Then by the Gronwall's inequality, we obtain (2.60). This completes the proof of Lemma 2.12. □

Corollary 2.3. *Under the conditions of Theorem 1.1, it holds that*

$$\sup_{t\in[0,T]} (\|u\|_{L^\infty} + \|u\|_{H^2}) \le K. \tag{2.65}$$

Proof. From (2.17) and (2.42), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|\nabla F\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla\omega\|_{L^2} &\le K\|m\dot{u}\|_{L^2}\\ &\le K.\end{aligned} \tag{2.66}$$

From (1.12), (2.10), (2.60) and (2.66), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|u\|_{H^2} &\le K(\|u\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla F\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla P\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla\omega\|_{L^2})\\ &\le K(\|u\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla F\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla m\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla n\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla\omega\|_{L^2})\\ &\le K.\end{aligned} \tag{2.67}$$

Then, from Sobolev's embedding theorem, we finish this proof of Corollary 2.3. □

Lemma 2.13. *Under the conditions of Theorem 1.1, it holds that*

$$\sup_{t\in[0,T]} \|m-\tilde{m}\|_{H^2} + \|n-\tilde{n}\|_{H^2} \le K. \tag{2.68}$$

Proof. From $(1.1)_1$ and (1.11), we have

$$\partial_t\Lambda_1(m(x,t)) + u\cdot\nabla\Lambda_1 + P\left(m(x,t),n(x,t)\right) - P(\tilde{m},\tilde{n}) = -F(x,t). \tag{2.69}$$

where Λ_1 satisfies that $\Lambda_1(\tilde{m}) = 0$ and $\Lambda_1'(m) = \frac{2\mu+\lambda}{m} > 0$. Similarly, from $(1.1)_2$ and (1.11), we have

$$\partial_t\Lambda_2(n(x,t)) + u\cdot\nabla\Lambda_2 + P\left(m(x,t),n(x,t)\right) - P(\tilde{m},\tilde{n}) = -F(x,t). \tag{2.70}$$

where Λ_2 satisfies that $\Lambda_2(\tilde{n}) = 0$ and $\Lambda_2'(n) = \frac{2\mu+\lambda}{n} > 0$.

Differentiating (2.69) with respect to x_i and x_j, multiplying both sides of the resulting equation by $\partial_i\partial_j\Lambda_1(m)$, integrating the result equality over $\mathbb{R}^3$, we obtain

$$\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\int|\partial_i\partial_j\Lambda_1(m)|^2dx \le \int\Big(|\partial_i\partial_j\Lambda_1(m)||\partial_i\partial_jF| + |\partial_i\partial_j\Lambda_1(m)||\partial_i\partial_jP| + |\partial_i\partial_j\Lambda_1(m)||\partial_i\partial_j(u\cdot\nabla\Lambda_1)|\Big)\,dx. \tag{2.71}$$

Using the Cauchy inequality and the Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality, we have

$$\|\Lambda_1(t)\|_{H^2}^2 \le \|\Lambda_1(0)\|_{H^2}^2 + K\int_0^t\Big((\|F\|_{H^2} + \|\Lambda_2\|_{H^2})\|\Lambda_1\|_{H^2} + (1+\|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty} + \|u\|_{H^2})\|\Lambda_1\|_{H^2}^2\Big)\,ds. \tag{2.72}$$

Similar to (2.72), from (2.70), we have

$$\|\Lambda_2(t)\|_{H^2}^2 \le \|\Lambda_2(0)\|_{H^2}^2 + K\int_0^t\Big((\|F\|_{H^2} + \|\Lambda_1\|_{H^2})\|\Lambda_2\|_{H^2} + (1+\|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty} + \|u\|_{H^2})\|\Lambda_2\|_{H^2}^2\Big)\,ds. \tag{2.73}$$

By (2.7), (2.10), (2.32), (2.38), (2.60), Hölder inequality and the Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\|F\|_{H^2} &\le K\left(\|F\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla m\dot{u}\|_{L^2} + \|m\nabla\dot{u}\|_{L^2}\right)\\ &\le K\left(1 + \|\nabla m\|_{L^3}\|\dot{u}\|_{L^6} + \|\nabla\dot{u}\|_{L^2}\right)\\ &\le K\left(1 + \|\nabla m\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}}\|\nabla^2 m\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}}\|\nabla\dot{u}\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla\dot{u}\|_{L^2}\right)\\ &\le K\left(1 + \|\Lambda_1\|_{H^2}(1+\|\nabla\dot{u}\|_{L^2}) + \|\nabla\dot{u}\|_{L^2}\right).\end{aligned} \tag{2.74}$$

Thus, from (2.42), (2.58), (2.65), (2.72), (2.73), and (2.74), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|\Lambda_1(t)\|_{H^2}^2 + \|\Lambda_2(t)\|_{H^2}^2 \\
&\leq \|\Lambda_1(0)\|_{H^2}^2 + \|\Lambda_2(0)\|_{H^2}^2 + K\int_0^t ((1 + \|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty} + \|\nabla \dot{u}\|_{L^2} + \|u\|_{H^2})(\|\Lambda_1\|_{H^2}^2 + \|\Lambda_2\|_{H^2}^2) + \|\nabla \dot{u}\|_{L^2}^2) ds \\
&\leq K + K\int_0^t (1 + \|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty} + \|\nabla \dot{u}\|_{L^2}) \left(\|\Lambda_1\|_{H^2}^2 + \|\Lambda_2\|_{H^2}^2\right) ds.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.75}$$

From (2.38), (2.60), and using the Gronwall's inequality, we can immediately obtain (2.68). □

Lemma 2.14. *Under the conditions of Theorem 1.1, it holds that*

$$\int_0^T \|u\|_{H^3}^2 dt \leq K. \tag{2.76}$$

Proof. From (2.8), (2.42), (2.68) and (2.74), we have

$$\int_0^T (\|F\|_{H^2}^2 + \|\omega\|_{H^2}^2) dt \leq K. \tag{2.77}$$

From (1.12), (2.10), (2.68) and (2.77), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_0^T \|u\|_{H^3}^2 dt &\leq K\int_0^T \left(\|u\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla F\|_{H^1} + \|\nabla(P(m,n) - P(\tilde{m},\tilde{n}))\|_{H^1} + \|\nabla\omega\|_{H^1}\right)^2 dt \\
&\leq K\int_0^T \left(\|u\|_{L^2} + \|F\|_{H^2} + \|m - \tilde{m}\|_{H^2} + \|n - \tilde{n}\|_{H^2} + \|\omega\|_{H^2}\right)^2 dt \\
&\leq K.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.78}$$

This completes the proof of Lemma 2.14. □

Lemma 2.15. *Under the conditions of Theorem 1.1, it holds that*

$$\sup_{t\in[0,T]} \int |\nabla \dot{u}|^2 dx + \int_0^T \int |\nabla^2 \dot{u}|^2 dxdt \leq K. \tag{2.79}$$

Proof. We take the operator $\nabla\partial_t + \nabla\mathrm{div}(u\cdot)$ in $(1.1)_3$, multiplying the resulting equations by $\nabla\dot{u}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\nabla\dot{u}^j\nabla[\partial_t(m\dot{u}^j) + \mathrm{div}(um\dot{u}^j)] + \nabla\dot{u}^j\nabla[\partial_j P_t + \mathrm{div}(u\partial_j P)] \\
&= \mu\nabla\dot{u}^j\nabla[\partial_t\Delta u^j + \mathrm{div}(u\Delta u^j)] + (\lambda + \mu)\nabla\dot{u}^j\nabla[\partial_j\partial_t(\mathrm{div}u) + \mathrm{div}(u\partial_j(\mathrm{div}u))].
\end{aligned} \tag{2.80}$$

Integrating the above equation over $\mathbb{R}^3$, and using integration by parts, then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{2}\int m|\nabla\dot{u}|^2 dx = \frac{1}{2}\int m_0|\nabla\dot{u}_0|^2 dx &- \int_0^t\int \nabla m\partial_t\dot{u}\nabla\dot{u}\, dxds - \int_0^t\int \nabla(mu_j)\partial_j\dot{u}\nabla\dot{u}\, dxds \\
&- \textstyle\int_0^t\int \nabla\dot{u}^j\nabla[\partial_j\partial_t P + \mathrm{div}(u\partial_j P)]\, dxds - \mu\textstyle\int_0^t\int \Delta\dot{u}^j[\Delta u_t^j + \mathrm{div}(u\Delta u^j)]\, dxds \\
&-(\lambda + \mu)\int_0^t\int \Delta\dot{u}^j[\partial_j\partial_t(\mathrm{div}u) + \mathrm{div}(u\partial_j(\mathrm{div}u))]\}\, dxds \\
&:= \sum_{i=1}^6 I_i.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.81}$$

From $m_0 - \tilde{m} \in H^2$, and $u_0 \in H^3$, we know

$$I_1 = \frac{1}{2}\int m_0|\nabla\dot{u}_0|^2dx \leq K. \tag{2.82}$$

From the integration by parts, the equation $(1.1)_3$, (2.38), (2.65), (2.68), (2.76), the Hölder inequality, the Cauchy inequality and the Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
I_2 &= -\int_0^t\int \nabla m\partial_t\dot{u}\nabla\dot{u}dxds \\
&= -\int_0^t\int \nabla m\partial_t\left(\frac{\mu\Delta u + (\mu+\lambda)\nabla(\mathrm{div}u) - \nabla P}{m}\right)\nabla\dot{u}dxds \\
&\leq K\int_0^t\int |\nabla m||\nabla\dot{u}|\Big(|\nabla^2u||\nabla u| + |\nabla u||\nabla m| + |\nabla u||\nabla n| + |\nabla m||\nabla n| + |\nabla^2u||\nabla m| \\
&\quad +|\nabla m|^2 + |\nabla n|^2 + |\nabla^3u| + |\Delta\dot{u}| + |\nabla\frac{D}{Dt}\mathrm{div}u|\Big)dxds \\
&\leq K\int_0^t\{\|\nabla\dot{u}\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}}\|\nabla^2\dot{u}\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\|\nabla^2\dot{u}\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla\frac{D}{Dt}\mathrm{div}u\|_{L^2})\|m-\tilde{m}\|_{H^2} \\
&\quad +\|\nabla^2\dot{u}\|_{L^2}[(\|u\|_{H^2}^2 + \|n\|_{H^2}^2 + 1)(\|\nabla m\|_{H^1}^3 + 1) + \|\nabla m\|_{H^1}\|u\|_{H^3}]\}ds \\
&\leq K + \frac{\mu}{10}\int_0^t(\|\nabla^2\dot{u}\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla\frac{D}{Dt}\mathrm{div}u\|_{L^2}^2)ds.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.83}$$

From the Hölder inequality, Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality and the Cauchy inequality, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
I_3 &= -\int_0^t\int \nabla(mu^j)\partial_j\dot{u}\nabla\dot{u}\,dxds \\
&= -\int_0^t\int \nabla mu^j\partial_j\dot{u}\nabla\dot{u} + \nabla u^jm\partial_j\dot{u}\nabla\dot{u}\,dxds \\
&\leq K\int_0^t\int \|\nabla\dot{u}\|_{L^4}^2(\|\nabla m\|_{L^2}\|u\|_{L^\infty} + \|\nabla u\|_{L^2})dxds \\
&\leq K\int_0^t\int \|\nabla\dot{u}\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}}\|\nabla^2\dot{u}\|_{L^2}^{\frac{3}{2}}dxds \\
&\leq K + \frac{\mu}{10}\int_0^t\|\nabla^2\dot{u}\|_{L^2}^2ds.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.84}$$

From the integration by parts, the equation $(1.1)_1$, $(1.1)_2$, (2.38), (2.65), (2.68), the Cauchy inequality, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
I_4 &= \int_0^t\int \Delta\dot{u}^j[\partial_jP_t + \mathrm{div}(\partial_jPu)]dxds \\
&= -\int_0^t\int \left(\partial_j\Delta\dot{u}^j(P_mm_t + P_nn_t) + \partial_k\Delta\dot{u}^j\partial_jPu^k\right)dxds \\
&= -\int_0^t\int \left([P_mm + P_nn]\mathrm{div}u\partial_j\Delta\dot{u}^j - \partial_k(\partial_j\Delta\dot{u}^ju^k)P + P\partial_j(\partial_k\Delta\dot{u}^ju^k)\right)dxds \\
&\leq K\left(\int_0^t\int(|\nabla^2u| + |\nabla m||\nabla u| + |\nabla n||\nabla u|)^2dxds\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(\int_0^t\int|\nabla^2\dot{u}|^2dxds\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\leq K + \frac{\mu}{10}\int_0^t\|\nabla^2\dot{u}\|_{L^2}^2ds.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.85}$$

From the integration by parts, the equation (2.38), (2.49), (2.65), (2.68), the Cauchy inequality, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
I_5 &= -\int_0^t \int \mu \Delta \dot{u}^j \left(\Delta u_t^j + \mathrm{div}(u \Delta u^j) \right) dxds \\
&= \int_0^t \int \mu \left(\partial_i \Delta \dot{u}^j \partial_i u_t^j + \Delta u^j u \cdot \nabla \Delta \dot{u}^j \right) dxds \\
&= \int_0^t \int \mu \left(\partial_i \Delta \dot{u}^j (\partial_i \dot{u}^j - \partial_i (u \cdot \nabla u^j)) + \Delta u^j u \cdot \nabla \Delta \dot{u}^j \right) dxds \\
&= \int_0^t \int \mu \left(-|\nabla^2 \dot{u}|^2 - \partial_i \Delta \dot{u}^j u^k \partial_k \partial_i u_t^j - \partial_i \Delta \dot{u}^j \partial_i u^k \partial_k u^j + \Delta u^j u \cdot \nabla \Delta \dot{u}^j \right) dxds \\
&= \int_0^t \int \mu \left(-|\nabla^2 \dot{u}|^2 + \partial_i \Delta \dot{u}^j \mathrm{div} u \partial_i u^j - \partial_i \Delta \dot{u}^j \partial_i u^k \partial_k u^j - \partial_i u^j \partial_i u^k \partial_k \Delta \dot{u}^j \right) dxds \\
&\leq -\frac{1}{2} \int_0^t \int \mu |\nabla^2 \dot{u}|^2 dxds + K \int_0^t \int |\nabla u|^4 dxds \\
&\leq -\frac{1}{2} \int_0^t \int \mu |\nabla^2 \dot{u}|^2 dxds + K.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.86}$$

From the integration by parts and the Cauchy inequality, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
I_6 &= -(\lambda + \mu) \int_0^t \int \Delta \dot{u}^j \left(\partial_j \partial_t (\mathrm{div} u) + \mathrm{div}(u \partial_j (\mathrm{div} u)) \right) dxds \\
&= (\lambda + \mu) \int_0^t \int \left(\partial_j \Delta \dot{u}^j [\partial_t (\mathrm{div} u) + \mathrm{div}(u \mathrm{div} u)] + \Delta \dot{u}^j \mathrm{div}(\partial_j u \mathrm{div} u) \right) dxds \\
&= (\lambda + \mu) \int_0^t \int \left(\partial_j \Delta \dot{u}^j [\partial_t (\mathrm{div} u) + \partial_k u^k \mathrm{div} u + u^k \partial_k \mathrm{div} u)] - \partial_i (\Delta \dot{u}^j) \partial_j u^i \mathrm{div} u \right) dxds \\
&\leq (\lambda + \mu) \int_0^t \int \partial_j \Delta \dot{u}^j \frac{D}{Dt} \mathrm{div} u dxds + K \int_0^t \int |\nabla^2 \dot{u}| |\nabla u| |\nabla^2 u| dxds \\
&\leq (\lambda + \mu) \int_0^t \int \left(\partial_j \Delta (\partial_t u^j + u \cdot \nabla u^j) \frac{D}{Dt} \mathrm{div} u \right) dxds + K \int_0^t \|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty} \|\nabla^2 \dot{u}\|_{L^2} \|\nabla^2 u\|_{L^2} ds
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq -(\lambda + \mu) \int_0^t \int |\nabla \frac{D}{Dt} \mathrm{div} u|^2 dxds + K \int_0^t \|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty} \|\nabla^2 u\|_{L^2} \left(\|\nabla^2 \dot{u}\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla \frac{D}{Dt} \mathrm{div} u\|_{L^2} \right) ds \\
&\leq -\frac{\lambda + \mu}{2} \int_0^t \int |\nabla \frac{D}{Dt} \mathrm{div} u|^2 dxds + \frac{\mu}{10} \int_0^T \|\nabla^2 \dot{u}\|_{L^2}^2 ds + K.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.87}$$

From (2.81)-(2.87) and (2.38), we immediately obtain (2.79). □

Lemma 2.16. *Under the conditions of Theorem 1.1, it holds that*

$$\sup_{t \in [0,T]} \|u\|_{H^3} \leq K. \tag{2.88}$$

$$\sup_{t \in [0,T]} \|(m - \tilde{m}, n - \tilde{n})\|_{H^3} \leq K. \tag{2.89}$$

$$\sup_{t \in [0,T]} \|(m_t, n_t)\|_{H^2} \leq K. \tag{2.90}$$

$$\int_0^T \left(\|u\|_{H^4}^2 + \|u_t\|_{H^2}^2 \right) dt \leq K. \tag{2.91}$$

Proof. From (1.12), (2.7), (2.8), (2.10), (2.68), (2.79) and the Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|u\|_{H^3} &\le K(\|u\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla F\|_{H^1} + \|\nabla(P(m,n) - P(\tilde{m},\tilde{n}))\|_{H^1} + \|\nabla\omega\|_{H^1})\\
&\le K(\|u\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla(m\dot{u})\|_{L^2} + \|m-\tilde{m}\|_{H^2} + \|n-\tilde{n}\|_{H^2})\\
&\le K(\|u\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla\dot{u}\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla m\dot{u}\|_{L^2} + \|m-\tilde{m}\|_{H^2} + \|n-\tilde{n}\|_{H^2})\\
&\le K. \qquad (2.92)
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we can get (2.88).

Differentiating (2.69) with respect to x_i , x_j, and x_k, multiplying both sides of the resulting equation by $\partial_i\partial_j\partial_k\Lambda_1(m)$, integrating the result equality over $\mathbb{R}^3$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\int |\partial_i\partial_j\partial_k\Lambda_1(m)|^2 dx \le \int (&|\partial_i\partial_j\partial_k\Lambda_1(m)||\partial_i\partial_j\partial_k F|\\
&+|\partial_i\partial_j\partial_k\Lambda_1(m)||\partial_i\partial_j\partial_k P| + |\partial_i\partial_j\partial_k\Lambda_1(m)||\partial_i\partial_j\partial_k(u\cdot\nabla\Lambda_1)|)dx. \qquad (2.93)
\end{aligned}$$

Using the Cauchy inequality and the Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality, we have

$$\|\Lambda_1(t)\|_{H^3}^2 \le \|\Lambda_1(0)\|_{H^3}^2 + K\int_0^t ((\|F\|_{H^3} + \|\Lambda_2\|_{H^3})\|\Lambda_1\|_{H^3} + (1 + \|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty} + \|u\|_{H^3})\|\Lambda_1\|_{H^3}^2)ds. \quad (2.94)$$

Similarly, from (2.70), we have

$$\|\Lambda_2(t)\|_{H^3}^2 \le \|\Lambda_2(0)\|_{H^3}^2 + K\int_0^t ((\|F\|_{H^3} + \|\Lambda_1\|_{H^3})\|\Lambda_2\|_{H^3} + (1 + \|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty} + \|u\|_{H^3})\|\Lambda_2\|_{H^3}^2)ds. \quad (2.95)$$

From (2.7), (2.18), (2.42), (2.68), (2.79) and the Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|F\|_{H^3} &\le K(\|F\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla m\dot{u}\|_{H^1} + \|m\nabla\dot{u}\|_{H^1})\\
&\le K(1 + \|\nabla^2 m\dot{u}\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla^2\dot{u}\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla m\nabla\dot{u}\|_{L^2})\\
&\le K(1 + \|\nabla^2\dot{u}\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla^2 m\|_{L^3}\|\dot{u}\|_{L^6} + \|\nabla m\|_{L^3}\|\nabla\dot{u}\|_{L^6})\\
&\le K(1 + \|\nabla^2\dot{u}\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla^2 m\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}}\|\nabla^3 m\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}}\|\nabla\dot{u}\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla m\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}}\|\nabla^2 m\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}}\|\nabla^2\dot{u}\|_{L^2})\\
&\le K(1 + \|\nabla^2\dot{u}\|_{L^2} + \|\Lambda_1\|_{H^3}). \qquad (2.96)
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, from (2.79), (2.88), (2.94), (2.95), and (2.96), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|\Lambda_1(t)\|_{H^3}^2 + \|\Lambda_2(t)\|_{H^3}^2\\
&\le \|\Lambda_1(0)\|_{H^3}^2 + \|\Lambda_2(0)\|_{H^3}^2 + K\int_0^t ((1 + \|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty} + \|\nabla^2\dot{u}\|_{L^2} + \|u\|_{H^3})(\|\Lambda_1\|_{H^3}^2 + \|\Lambda_2\|_{H^3}^2) + \|\nabla^2\dot{u}\|_{L^2}^2)ds\\
&\le K + K\int_0^t (1 + \|\nabla^2\dot{u}\|_{L^2})(\|\Lambda_1\|_{H^3}^2 + \|\Lambda_2\|_{H^3}^2)ds,
\end{aligned} \qquad (2.97)$$

where we have used $m_0 - \tilde{m} \in H^3$, $n_0 - \tilde{n} \in H^3$.

Using (2.79), (2.97) and the Gronwall's inequality, we have

$$\|\Lambda_1(t)\|_{H^3}^2 + \|\Lambda_2(t)\|_{H^3}^2 \le K. \qquad (2.98)$$

Thus, we can immediately obtain (2.89).

From $(1.1)_1$, $(1.1)_2$, (2.88) and (2.89), we get

$$\sup_{t\in[0,T]} \|(m_t, n_t)\|_{H^2} \le K.$$

Then we get (2.90).

From (2.8), (2.79), (2.98) and (2.96), we have

$$\int_0^T \left(\|F\|_{H^3}^2 + \|\omega\|_{H^3}^2\right) dt \leq K. \tag{2.99}$$

From (1.12), (2.10), (2.89) and (2.99), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^T \|u\|_{H^4}^2 dt &\leq K \int_0^T \left(\|u\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla F\|_{H^2}^2 + \|\nabla(P(m,n) - P(\tilde{m},\tilde{n}))\|_{H^2}^2 + \|\nabla\omega\|_{H^2}^2\right) dt \\ &\leq K \int_0^T \left(\|u\|_{L^2}^2 + \|F\|_{H^3}^2 + \|m - \tilde{m}\|_{H^3}^2 + \|n - \tilde{n}\|_{H^3}^2 + \|\omega\|_{H^3}^2\right) dt \\ &\leq K. \end{aligned} \tag{2.100}$$

From $\dot{u} = u_t + u \cdot \nabla u$, (2.79) and (2.88), we have

$$\int_0^T \|u_t\|_{H^2}^2 dt \leq K. \tag{2.101}$$

Then we get (2.101).

This completes the proof of Lemma 2.16. □

Step 3: Completion of the proof of Theorem 1.1.

By Lemmas 2.1, 2.9 and 2.16, we get (2.1) and (2.2), which concludes a contradiction. Thus, $T^* = \infty$. The proof of Theorem 1.1 is complete.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank the anonymous referees for their constructive suggestions and kindly comments. The authors also thank professor Changjiang Zhu and Dr. Lei Yao for their helpful discussion. This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China #10625105, #11071093, the PhD specialized grant of the Ministry of Education of China #20100144110001, and the Special Fund for Basic Scientific Research of Central Colleges #CCNU10C01001.

References

[1] Y. Cho, H. Kim, On classical solutions of the compressible Navier-Stokes equations with non-negative initial densities, Manuscripta math., 120(2006), 91-129.

[2] S. Evje, T. Flåtten, H.A. Friis, Global weak solutions for a viscous liquid-gas model with transition to single-phase gas flow and vacuum, Nonlinear Anal., TMA, 70(2009), 3864-3886.

[3] S. Evje, K.H. Karlsen, Global existence of weak solutions for a viscous two-phase model, J. Differential Equations, 245(2008), 2660-2703.

[4] S. Evje, K.H. Karlsen, Global weak solutions for a viscous liquid-gas model with singular pressure law, Commun. Pure Appl. Anal., 8(2009), 1867-1894.

[5] H.A. Friis, S. Evje, T. Flatten, A numerical study of characteristic slow-transicent behavior of a compressible 2D gas-liquid two-fluid model, Adv. Appl. Math. Mech., 1(2009), 166-200.

[6] Z.H. Guo, J. Yang, L. Yao, Global strong solution for a three-dimensional viscous liquid-gas two-phase flow model with vacuum, J. Math. Phy., 52, 093102(2011).

[7] D. Hoff, Compressible flow in a half-space with Navier boundary conditons, J. Math. Fluid Mech, 7(1995), 315-338.

[8] D. Hoff, Global solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations for multidimensional compressible flow with discontinuous initial data, J. Differential Equations, 120(1995), 215-254.

[9] Y.Z. Sun, C. Wang, Z.F. Zhang, A Beale-Kato-Majda blow-up criterion for the 3-D compressible Navier-Stokes equations, J. Math. Pures Appl., 95(2011), 36-47.

[10] Y.Z. Sun, Z.F. Zhang, A blow-up criterion of strong solution for the 2-D compressible Navier-Stokes equations, Sci. China Math., 54 (2011), 105-116.

[11] H.Y. Wen, L. Yao, C.J. Zhu, A blow-up criterion of strong solution to a 3D viscous liquid-gas two-phase flow model with vacuum, J. Math. Pures Appl., 97(2012), 204-229.

[12] L. Yao, C.J. Zhu, Free boundary value problem for a viscous two-phase model with mass-dependent viscosity, J. Differential Equations, 247(2009), 2705-2739.

[13] L. Yao, C.J. Zhu, Existence and uniqueness of global weak solution to a two-phase flow model with vacuum, Math. Ann., 349(2011), 903-928.

[14] L. Yao, T. Zhang, C.J. Zhu, Existence and asymptotic behavior of global weak solutions to a 2D viscous liquid-gas two-phase flow model, SIAM J. Math. Anal., 42(2010), 1874-1897.

[15] T. Zhang, D.Y. Fang, Compressible flows with a density-dependent viscosity coefficient, SIAM J. Math. Anal., 41(2009), 2453-2488.

[16] T. Zhang, Global solutions of compressible barotropic Navier-Stokes equations with a density-dependent viscosity coefficient, J. Mathematical Physics, 52, 043510 (2011), 1-26.